REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain pending in the instant application. All claims presently stand rejected. Claims 1, 9, 14, and 17 are amended herein. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 17, and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boucher et al. (US 2002/156927 A1).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Amended independent claim 1 now recites, in pertinent part,

> transmitting the message buffer in the form of at least one packet payload directly from the host memory to a network communication link, **without intermediate buffering of the at least one packet payload by the offload engine**, during transmission of packets by the offload engine.

Applicants respectfully submit that Boucher fails to disclose transmitting packet payloads directly from host memory to a network communication link without intermediate buffering of the packet payloads by the offload engine.

The Office Action cites INIC/CPD 30 illustrated in FIG. 2 of Boucher as corresponding to the claimed "offload engine" and cites the communication control block (CCB) as corresponding to the claimed message contexts. Furthermore, the Office Action cites FIG. 5 of Boucher as illustrating "performing protocol processing at the offload engine while leaving the message buffer in the host memory" and specifically identifies the fast-path operating mode as disclosing transmitting a packet payload directly from host memory to a network communication link.

However, Boucher states,

> Guided by the CCB, the processor 55 moves network frame-sized portions of the data **from the source in host memory 35 into its own memory 60** using DMA, as depicted by arrow 99. The processor 55 **then prepends appropriate headers and checksums to the data portions, and transmits**

the resulting frames to the network 25, consistent with the restrictions of the associated protocols.

Boucher, para. [0049]. Accordingly, this portion of Boucher discloses that data is moved from host memory 35 into memory 60 of CPD 30, where the data is temporarily buffered prior to transmission onto network 25. In contrast, independent claim 1 recites, "transmitting the message buffer in the form of at least one packet payload **directly from the host memory to a network communication link, without intermediate buffering** of the at least one packet payload **by the offload engine**. For example, the embodiments discussed in paragraphs [0019] and [0022] of Applicants' specification, eliminate overheads associated with the store-and-forward stage in the TCP transmission path in a TCP offload engine by transferring payload data directly from host memory 110 to the network communication link without intermediate buffering by a TCP offload engine. In contrast, Boucher teaches use of the store-and-forward stage within CPD 30, by temporarily buffer the payload data within memory 60 internal to CPD 30 (see FIG. 5 of Boucher).

Consequently, Boucher fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Independent claims 9, 14, and 17 include similar novel elements as independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the instant §102 rejections of claims 1, 9, 14, and 17 is requested.

The dependent claims are novel over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 102 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 7, 15, and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boucher et al. in view of Official Notice.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

The dependent claims are nonobvious over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 103 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

   It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

       Respectfully submitted,

       BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 18, 2008   /Cory G. Claassen/

       Cory G. Claassen
       Reg. No. 50,296
       Phone: (206) 292-8600

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040